

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
MONROE DIVISION

ROBERT L. FREEMAN

CIVIL ACTION NO. 06-0357-M

VS.

SECTION P

GERALD McMURRAY

JUDGE JAMES

MAGISTRATE JUDGE HAYES

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the court is a civil rights complaint (42 U.S.C. § 1983) filed *in forma pauperis* on February 27, 2006, by *pro se* plaintiff, Robert L. Freeman. At the time of his filing, plaintiff was an inmate at the Richland Parish Detention Center, Rayville, Louisiana.

On March 27, 2006, plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* was granted and a copy of that order was mailed to plaintiff at the address he had originally provided. [doc. 3] On April 5, 2006, the order was returned to the Clerk by the United States Postal Service with the notation "Gone."

LAW AND ANALYSIS

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 41(b) permits dismissal of claims "For failure of the plaintiff to prosecute or to comply with ... any order of court..." The district court also has the inherent authority to dismiss an action *sua sponte*, without motion by a defendant. *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1388-89, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962). "The power to invoke this sanction is necessary in order to prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases and to avoid congestion in the calendars of the [d]istrict [c]ourts." *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir.1988). Further, Local Rule (LR) 41.3W provides in part, "The failure of a[...] *pro se* litigant to keep the court apprised of an address change may be considered cause for dismissal for failure to prosecute when a notice is returned to the court for

the reason of an incorrect address and no correction is made to the address for a period of thirty days." More than thirty days have elapsed since the order granting *in forma pauperis* status was returned to the court, and plaintiff has still not provided his current address. Therefore,

IT IS RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's Civil Rights Complaint be **DISMISSED** in accordance with the provisions of FRCP Rule 41(b) and LR41.3W.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. Section 636(b)(1)(C) and Rule 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have ten (10) business days from service of this report and recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court. A party may respond to another party's objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of any objections or response to the district judge at the time of filing.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed factual findings and/or the proposed legal conclusions reflected in this Report and Recommendation within ten (10) days following the date of its service, or within the time frame authorized by Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b), shall bar an aggrieved party from attacking either the factual findings or the legal conclusions accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. See, Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996).

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Monroe, Louisiana, this 10th day of May, 2006.



KAREN L. HAYES
U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE